	Case 2:20-cv-00748-JAM-DMC Docume	nt 23 Filed 03/22/21 Page 1 of 2
1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
9	FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
10		
11	TREVON R. KIRKLAND,	No. 2:20-CV-0748-JAM-DMC-P
12	Petitioner,	
13	v.	<u>ORDER</u>
14	DIAZ,	
15	Respondent.	
16		
17	Petitioner, a state prisoner proceeding pro se, brings this petition for a writ of	
18	habeas corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254. The matter was referred to a United States	
19	Magistrate Judge pursuant to Eastern District of California local rules.	
20	On November 23, 2020, the Magistrate Judge filed findings and recommendations	
21	herein which were served on the parties and which contained notice that the parties may file	
22	objections within the time specified therein. No objections to the findings and recommendations	
23	have been filed.	
24	The Court has reviewed the file and finds the findings and recommendations to be	
25	supported by the record and by the Magistrate Judge's analysis.	
26	///	
27	///	
28	///	
	1	
	I	

Pursuant to Rule 11(a) of the Federal Rules Governing Section 2254 Cases, the		
Court has considered whether to issue a certificate of appealability. Before Petitioner can app		
this decision, a certificate of appealability must issue. See 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c); Fed. R. App. P.		
22(b). Where the petition is denied on the merits, a certificate of appealability may issue under		
28 U.S.C. § 2253 "only if the applicant has made a substantial showing of the denial of a		
constitutional right." 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2). The court must either issue a certificate of		
appealability indicating which issues satisfy the required showing or must state the reasons why		
such a certificate should not issue. See Fed. R. App. P. 22(b). Where the petition is dismissed on		
procedural grounds, a certificate of appealability "should issue if the prisoner can show: (1) 'that		
jurists of reason would find it debatable whether the district court was correct in its procedural		
ruling'; and (2) 'that jurists of reason would find it debatable whether the petition states a valid		
claim of the denial of a constitutional right." Morris v. Woodford, 229 F.3d 775, 780 (9th Cir.		
2000) (quoting <u>Slack v. McDaniel</u> , 529 U.S. 473, 120 S.Ct. 1595, 1604 (2000)). For the reasons		
set forth in the Magistrate Judge's findings and recommendations, the Court finds that issuance of		
a certificate of appealability is not warranted in this case.		
Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:		
1. The findings and recommendations filed November 23, 2020, are adopted		
in full;		

- 2. Respondent's motion to dismiss, ECF No. 12, is granted;
- Petitioner's petition for a writ of habeas corpus is dismissed; 3.
- 4. The Court declines to issue a certificate of appealability; and
- The Clerk of the Court is directed to enter judgment and close this file. 5.

DATED: March 19, 2021

/s/ John A. Mendez

THE HONORABLE JOHN A. MENDEZ UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT JUDGE